

MEMBRANE FOULING DURING FERTILISER DRAWN FORWARD OSMOSIS DESALINATION USING BRACKISH GROUNDWATER

By

FEZEH LOTFI

A thesis submitted in fulfilment for the degree of

Master of Engineering



School of Civil and Environmental Engineering

Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology

University of Technology, Sydney (UTS), New South Wales,
Australia

October 2013

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP/ORIGINALITY

I certify that this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledge within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of candidate

Fezeh Lotfi

For my wonderful husband, Dr. Behnam Fatahi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Well here it is, my thesis, finished! It's taken a long time to get to this point and I have a lot of people to thank. Each of the following people has my lasting gratitude for helping me reach this exciting milestone.

Firstly, I'd like to express my deep gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Ho Kyong Shon for his direction, wisdom, insight and patience. I'm also much obliged to my co-supervisor Dr. Sherub Phuntsho for his goading, exhortation and encouragement.

My most profound thanks, my most heartfelt appreciation, my deepest gratitude goes to my husband Dr. Behnam Fatahi without whom none of this could have been accomplished. Also I must express my gratitude to Mr Parviz Lotfi, my Dad and Mrs Akhtarosadat Yosofi my Mum, thanks for your unwavering confidence in me, for your love and sacrifice. Special thanks to Dr. Behzad Fatahi for his support and encouragement. Finally, thanks to my sisters (Temi and Forough).

I sincerely acknowledge the help I received from my colleagues, without whose support I would not have been able to complete this thesis on time. In particular, I want to acknowledge the contribution made by Mr. Tahir Majeed, Mr. Soleyman Sahebi, Miss. Laura Chekli and Miss Jung Eun.

I also acknowledge the administrative and logistic supports received from Mrs. Phyllis Agius, Craig Knowles, Tim and Van Lee during my research.

This research was supported by the National Centre of Excellence in Desalination Australia, funded by the Australian Government through the Water for the Future initiative.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

FO: Forward osmosis

FDFO: Fertiliser drawn forward osmosis

RO: Reverse osmosis

PRO: Pressure retarded osmosis

BGW: Brackish groundwater

DS: Draw solution

CP: Concentration polarisation

ICP: Internal concentration polarisation

ECP: External concentration polarisation

CTA: Cellulose triacetate

PA: Thin film composite polyamide

HTI: Hydration Technology Innovations

NF: Nanofiltration

TDS: Total dissolved solids

DI water: Deionised water

DAP: Diamminium phosphate or $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{HPO}_4$

MAP: Monoammonium phosphate or $\text{NH}_4\text{H}_2\text{PO}_4$

SOA: Sulphate of ammonia or $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{SO}_4$

CAN: Calcium nitrate tetra hydrate

MW: Molecular weight

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	CHAPTER 1	1
	INTRODUCTION	
1.1	Introduction	2
1.2	Research objectives	5
1.3	Outline of thesis	6
2	CHAPTER 2	8
	LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1	Water purification membranes	9
2.1.1	Low pressure membranes	11
2.1.2	High-pressure membranes	12
2.1.3	Forward osmosis membrane process	13
2.1.3.1	Concentration polarisation in FO process	17
2.2	Membrane fouling in the pressure based membrane process	21
2.2.1	Organic fouling	23
2.2.2	Inorganic fouling/ scaling	26
2.3	Fouling mechanism in pressure based membrane process	29
2.3.1	Fouling caused by concentration polarisation	30
2.3.2	Particle blocking	32
2.3.3	Stages of fouling	37
2.4	Factor affecting membrane fouling in pressure based membrane	39
2.4.1	Effects of feed properties	39
2.4.2	Effects of membrane properties	41
2.4.3	Effects of membrane operating parameters	43
2.5	Fouling reduction, conventional methods of cleaning in pressure based membrane process	44
2.5.1	Physical membrane cleaning methods	44
2.5.2	Sponge ball cleaning	44
2.5.3	Forward and reverse membrane flushing	45

2.5.4	Backwashing membrane cleaning.....	46
2.5.5	Pre-treatment process.....	47
2.6	Methods to estimate fouling in pressure based membrane process	50
2.6.1	Fouling coefficient.....	50
2.6.2	Hydraulic resistance.....	51
2.6.3	Membrane imaging.....	51
2.7	Membrane fouling and scaling in the FO proces.....	52
2.7.1	Colloidal and organic fouling.....	54
2.7.2	Inorganic scaling and fouling.....	55
2.8	Fertiliser drawn forward osmosis (FDFO) desalination.....	56
2.8.1	The concept of FDFO process.....	59
2.8.2	Prospects of FDFO desalination process.....	60
2.8.3	Fouling potential in the FDFO process.....	61
3	CHAPTER 3.....	63
	METERIALS AND METHODS	
3.1	Introduction.....	64
3.2	Feed solutions for the FDFO process.....	64
3.3	Draw solutions for the forward osmosis experiments.....	66
3.4	Organic foulants.....	68
3.5	Forward osmosis membranes.....	69
3.6	Bench scale cross-flow forward osmosis experimental set-up.....	70
3.7	Protocols of fouling and cleaning experiments.....	74
3.8	Membrane fouling identification methods.....	76
3.8.1	Scanning electron microscopy (SEM).....	76
3.8.2	Energy dispersive spectroscopy (EDS).....	77
3.8.3	X-ray diffraction (XRD).....	78
4	CHAPTER 4.....	79

WATER FLUX BEHAVIOR AND MEMBRANE FOULING DURING FERTILISER DRAWN FORWARD OSMOSIS PROCESS

4.1	Introduction.....	80
4.2	Methodology.....	81
4.3	Influence of draw solution properties on inorganic scaling.....	82
4.3.1	Influence of the types of draw solution on the water flux decline...	82
4.3.2	Influence of the draw solution concentration on the water flux decline.....	86
4.4	Influence of feed solution; TDS, type, concentration on the water flux decline.....	93
4.5	Influence of membrane properties on the water flux decline.....	96
4.5.1	Comparison of water flux behavior and membrane fouling between two PA membranes.....	100
4.6	FO fouling reversibility by cleaning.....	101
4.7	Concluding remarks.....	107

5 CHAPTER 5.....108

FACTORS AFFECTING SEVERE FLUX DECLINE DURING FERTILISER DRAWN FORWARD OSMOSIS PROCESS USING DIAMMONIUM PHOSPHATE AS DRAW SOLUTION

5.1	Introduction.....	109
5.2	Materials and methods.....	111
5.3	FDFO desalination of BGW using DAP as DS.....	112
5.4	Factors affecting severe flux decline during the FDFO desalination process using DAP as DS.....	119
5.4.1	Influence of DAP concentration on water flux decline.....	120
5.4.2	Influence of FS concentration on water flux decline.....	122
5.4.3	Influence of FS chemistry.....	124
5.4.4	Effect of membrane material on water flux decline.....	131
5.4.5	Influence of combined fouling (organic-inorganic) on water flux behavior.....	136
5.4.6	Influence of membrane orientation on water flux behavior.....	139

5.4.7	Influence of physical cleaning of the water flux recovery.....	140
5.4.8	Influence of spacer on the scaling potential.....	145
5.5	Conclusions.....	150
6	CHAPTER 6.....	152
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS		
6.1	Conclusions.....	153
6.2	Recommendations.....	155

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1: Scheme of different pressure-driven membrane filtration processes and rejection capacities.....	12
Figure 2.2: Water flows in FO, PRO and RO process. For FO process, ΔP is approximately zero and water transports to the higher osmotic pressure side of the membrane. For PRO process, water transports to the more saline liquid that is under positive pressure ($\Delta\pi > \Delta P$). For RO process, water transports to the lower osmotic pressure side due to hydraulic pressure ($\Delta P > \Delta\pi$).....	17
Figure 2.3: A schematic of concentrative polarisation.....	19
Figure 2.4: Influence of concentration polarization in the water flux, Concentrative (a) and dilutive (b) ICP. π_b is bulk osmotic pressure difference, π_m is the membrane osmotic pressure difference (less than π_b due to ECP), π_a is the effective osmotic pressure difference across the membrane active layer (less than π_m due to ICP) (Cath et al., 2006a).....	20
Figure 2.5: Water passes through the semipermeable membrane.....	22
Figure 2.6: A schematic for cross-flow filtration.....	23
Figure 2.7: Flux decline during dead end (---) and cross-flow (—) filtration processes.....	25

Figure 2.8: Filtration models (Blocking lows).....	35
Figure 2.9: The three stages of flux decline during cross-flow filtration. Adapted from, Marshall and Daufin (1995).....	38
Figure 2.10: Physical cleaning (reverse flushing).....	45
Figure 2.11: Physical cleaning (backwashing).....	47
Figure 3.1: Bench-scale cross-flow forward osmosis experimental setup (a) Schematic of the bench-scale cross-flow FO membrane unit and (b) the bench-scale FO unit used for all FO experiments.....	73
Figure 3.2: a) Close up of FO membrane cell, b) Inside the FO membrane cell.....	74
Figure 3.3: Experimental protocol.....	75
Figure 4.1: Variation of water flux over time for the six different fertiliser solutions during the FDFO process for the desalination of BGW, (Experimental conditions, DS: 1 M of each fertiliser, FS: 10 g/L BGW, cross-flow velocity: 400 ml/min and temperature $25\pm1^{\circ}\text{C}$, CTA membrane).....	85

Figure 4.2: Effect of DS concentration in the water flux, (Experimental condition; FS: 10 g/l BGW, cross-flow velocity 400 ml/min; and temperature $25\pm1^{\circ}\text{C}$, CTA membrane).....	90
Figure 4.3: Variation of FO water flux with time during the FO process at different concentrations of MAP. (Experimental conditions; DS: DAP (1 M, 1.25 M, 1.5 M, 1.75 M, 2 M) FS: BGW 10 g/L, water cross-flow velocity: 400 ml/min; CTA membrane and a temperature of $25\pm1^{\circ}\text{C}$).....	91
Figure 4.4: Average water flux for different fertilisers in 3 M concentration, (Experimental conditions; FS: 10 g/l BGW, cross-flow velocity: 400 ml/min, temperature $25\pm1^{\circ}\text{C}$ and CTA membrane).....	93
Figure 4.5: Effect of FS concentration in water flux decline, (Experimental conditions, DS: 3 M of each fertiliser, FS: BGW 10, BGW 20 and BGW 35, temperature: $25 \pm 1^{\circ}\text{C}$ and cross-flow rates: 400 ml/min in with membrane active layers facing FS).....	95
Figure 4.6: Comparison of average water flux on the fresh CTA and PA membranes, (Experimental conditions, DS: 3 molar of each fertiliser, FS: 35 g/l BGW as FS, cross-flow velocity: 400 ml/min and temperature $25\pm1^{\circ}\text{C}$).....	99

Figure 4.7: Comparative SEM images of the cross section of the two membranes (a) PA membrane, (b) CTA membrane (Qiu et al., 2012)(Wei et al., 2005).....99

Figure 4.8: Variation of water flux in terms of different membrane materials, (Experimental conditions, DS: 3M KCl, FS: 35 g/l BGW, temperature: $25\pm 1^{\circ}\text{C}$ and cross-flow rate: 400 ml/min in with membrane active layers facing FS).....101

Figure 4.9: Membrane cleaning and fouling mechanism, (a) membrane fouling and (b) membrane cleaning (c) membrane cleaning protocol.....103

Figure 4.10: Comparison of average baseline water fluxes on fouled membrane after cleaning with water flux on the fresh new membrane, (Experimental conditions: fouling experiment 3 M of DS, FS: BGW 35 g/L , 60 mg/l alginate, Baseline experiment condition: 1 M NaCl as DS and DI as FS).....104

Figure 4.11: Flux recovery of the FO membrane after membrane has been fouled by inorganic foulant (a) using three different types of DS and (b) using DAP as DS at different concentrations. All cleaning regimes were conducted at cross-flow rates of 400 ml/min in for 20 minutes.....106

Figure 5.1: SEM images of CTA membrane after experiment with DAP as DS and BGW as FS. a) active layer of the membrane surface, (b) both active layer

and support layer of the FO membrane, (c) on the wall of the acrylic membrane cell facing FS and (d) magnified image of the scaling layer.....115

Figure 5.2: The EDS spectrum for the active layer of the membrane after the fouling experiment. The scale deposit mainly consists of phosphorous, sulphate, calcium and magnesium.....117

Figure 5.3: (a) Illustration of inorganic crystal formation in the membrane active layer due to reverse diffusion of phosphate, (b) Bridging effect of phosphate during cross flow filtration.....118

Figure 5.4: Effect of DAP concentration on water flux decline (Experimental conditions; DS: DAP (1 M, 1.5 M, 2 M, 2.5 M, 3 M), FS: BGW 10 g/L, water cross-flow velocity: 400 ml/min, membrane: CTA and a temperature: $25\pm1^{\circ}\text{C}$).....121

Figure 5.5: Effect of FS concentration on water flux decline (Experimental conditions; DS: 3 M DAP, FS: BGW (10 g/L, 20 g/l, 35 g/l), cross-flow velocity: 400 ml/min, membrane: CTA and temperature: $25\pm1^{\circ}\text{C}$).....123

Figure 5.6: Influence of feed chemistry (Experimental condition: DS: 3M DAP, FS (35 g/L BGW, 35 g/L BGW without Mg, 35 g/L BGW without Ca, 35 g/L BGW without Mg and Ca), water cross-flow velocity: 400 ml/min , the CTA membrane and temperature: $25\pm1^{\circ}\text{C}$).....127

Figure 5.7: XRD analyses of deposition on the membranes after the specific duration of operation by employing the DAP experiment and BGW without calcium.....	128
Figure 5.8: XRD analyses of deposition on the membranes after the specific duration of operation by employing DAP experiment and BGW without magnesium.....	130
Figure 5.9: Effect of membrane material in water flux decline (Experimental conditions; DS: 3 M DAP, FS: 35 g/l BGW, cross-flow velocity: 400 ml/min, CTA and PA membrane and a temperature: 25±1 °C).....	134
Figure 5.10: Effect of membrane material in water flux decline (Experimental conditions; DS: 3 M DAP, FS: 35 g/l BGW, water cross-flow velocity: 400 ml/min, membrane: CTA, PA-1 and PA-2 and temperature: 25±1°C)....	136
Figure 5.11: water flux behavior of combine fouling, (Experimental conditions; DS: 3M DAP, FS: 35 g/l BGW, 60 mg/l of each foulant, water cross-flow velocity: 400 ml/min, PA membrane and temperature: 25±1 °C).....	138
Figure 5.12: water flux behavior of combine fouling (Experimental conditions; DS: 3 M DAP, FS: 35 g/l BGW, organic foulant: 60 mg/l alginate, water cross-flow velocity: 400 ml/min, CTA membrane and temperature: 25±1°C)	139

Figure 5.13: Influence of membrane orientation in water flux decline during the fouling experiment. Experimental conditions; DS: 3 M DAP, FS: 35 g/l BGW, water cross-flow velocity: 400 ml/min, CTA membrane and a temperature of $25\pm 1^{\circ}\text{C}$141

Figure 5.14: Comparison of baseline experiments before fouling experiment and after fouling experiment with membrane flushing to observe flux recovery rate (Experimental conditions: DS; 1 M NaCl, FS: DI water, water cross-flow velocity: 400 ml/min, CTA membrane and a temperature: $25\pm 1^{\circ}\text{C}$).....143

Figure 5.15: influence of cross-flow velocity in water flux recovery rate (Experimental conditions, baseline: DS; 1 M NaCl, FS: DI water, water cross-flow velocity: 400 ml/min, CTA membrane and a temperature: $25\pm 1^{\circ}\text{C}$, FDFO operation: DS; 3 M DAP, FS: 35 g/l BGW, organic foulant: alginate)...144

Figure 5.16: Flux recovery of the FO membrane after membrane has been fouled by inorganic foulant, using DAP as DS at different concentrations. All cleaning regimes were conducted at a cross-flow rate of 400 ml/min for 20 minutes.....146

Figure 5.17: Feed spacer as a hydraulic fouling control method, a) membrane fouling with spacer b) spacer in feed side of membrane in membrane cell.....149

Figure 5.18: Impact of feed spacer on FO fouling ring FDFO process.....150

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Reported experimental values of the K_{sp} for struvite (25 °C).....	58
Table 3.1: Detailed composition of synthetic BGW feed for various TDS concentrations. This composition simulates the BGW usually found at Buronga SIS in the MDB. Osmotic pressure was calculated using the OLI Stream Analyser 3.2 (OLI Systems Inc., Morris Plains, NJ, US).....	65
Table 3.2: Type of FS used for FDFO studies, Osmotic pressure of the FS was determined by the OLI Stream Analyser.....	66
Table 3.3: List of chemicals used as draw solutes for the bench-scale cross-flow FDFO desalination process.....	68
Table 3.4: Physical and chemical properties of membranes as provided by the manufacturer for TFC FO membranes and from various literature relating to the CTA membrane (Gu et al., 2013).....	70
Table 3.5: Physical and chemical properties of the PA-2 membranes.....	71
Table 4.1: DS bulk osmotic pressures (π) were calculated using OLI stream analyser.....	84

Abstract

Freshwater has become a scarce resource in many parts of the world and has been recognised as a critical global issue. By far, agriculture is the largest consumer of global freshwater, reaching a proportion that exceeds 70% of the total water consumption, mainly in the form of irrigation. In 2006, 54% of the total water use in Australia related to the irrigation of farms and pastures although the figure was much higher in previous years. Due to the rapid growth in the world's population, water demand for agriculture will keep increasing to meet the corresponding food demands. Creating new water sources can reduce pressure on the existing fresh water resources. Hence, desalination can play a key role in creating a new water sources because saline water sources exist in abundance. However, current desalination technologies are energy and cost intensive and this can have negative impacts on the environment and natural resources.

Forward osmosis (FO) has been recognised as one of the most promising low energy processes for desalination. The FO process, as an alternative to conventional desalination techniques, has attracted much attention in recent years. The driving force in the FO process is generated by the osmotic pressure difference between the feed water and the concentrated draw solution (DS).

Where a natural source of high concentration DS is available, FO can be highly attractive due to its significantly lower energy demand for pumping. Fertiliser drawn forward osmosis (FDFO) desalination has been recently studied as one of

the most practical applications of FO for irrigation. The study indicated that most commercially available fertilisers can be used as osmotic draw solutes. This led to the idea of applying FO technology in agriculture where the diluted fertiliser DS containing desalinated water can be used directly for fertigation (fertilised irrigation) instead of further subjecting it to a separation process.

Despite the many benefits of membrane technologies, the unavoidable issue of membrane fouling during membrane filtration remains a problem. Membrane fouling is a process where solute or particles deposit onto a membrane surface or into membrane pores. Membrane fouling causes a reduction in the permeate yield and a decrease in the quality of water produced, which leads to an increase in the operational and capital costs of the entire membrane filtration process.

It is generally accepted that fouling reduces the performance of membrane. When the fouling occurs, a thick gel layer and cake layer are formed on and in the membrane, causing the permeate flux to decline and increasing the operational costs due to the need for higher energy, cleaning frequency and/or the reduced life of the membrane. Mechanisms of fouling in pressure-driven membrane processes have been investigated extensively. By contrast, only a few studies have so far targeted membrane fouling during the FO process.

This study investigates the influence of various factors affecting the water flux behavior and membrane fouling during the desalination of brackish groundwater by FDFO process. The major factors responsible for the performance of FDFO water flux behavior are thoroughly investigated and their implications to the

overall process were discussed. The major factors assessed include membrane properties, DS properties and FS properties. The influences of all these factors have been measured in terms of water flux decline. A membrane autopsy has also been conducted to identify the inorganic scaling that forms on the membrane surface. Foulants have been analysed using Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM), energy dispersive spectroscopy (EDS) and X-Ray Diffraction (XRD).

Six commercially available fertilisers (Potassium chloride, potassium nitrate, ammonium sulphate, monoammonium phosphate or MAP, diammonium phosphate or DAP, calcium nitrate) have been selected as DS to observe the effects of different fertilisers in water flux behavior during the FDFO process. DAP, having one of the highest osmotic pressures amongst the six selected fertiliser solutions has been found to produce unexpected water flux behavior with severe flux decline during the FDFO desalination of brackish ground water (BGW).

The XRD results indicate that the scales formed on the membrane surface during FDFO process using DAP as DS are mainly composed of magnesium phosphate (MgHPO_4) and magnesium ammonium phosphate ($\text{MgNH}_4\text{PO}_4 \cdot 6\text{H}_2\text{O}$) or struvite. These insoluble compounds are formed because of the reverse diffusion of DAP towards the feed during the osmotic process which then reacts with the magnesium ions present in the FS.

This study shows that, the selection of fertiliser as DS is important for several reasons. Fertilisers that generate higher water flux at lower concentrations are

preferable as these can contribute to significant cost savings in terms of both capital and operational costs. The other important characteristic of DS is that, it should have lower membrane scaling and fouling potential. Fertilisers that produce steady water flux and lower membrane scaling and fouling during long-term operation are preferable for FDFO application.

This work also seeks to show that besides the selection of suitable fertiliser as DS during the long term FDFO process, the selection of an appropriate membrane for the selected fertiliser is also essential. The interaction between fertiliser properties and membrane characteristics has a significant influence in water flux behavior.

As in real situations, varied types of foulants always coexist in natural waters. In addition to inorganic scaling by super saturation of calcium and sulfate ions, which are common in brackish groundwater, organic fouling is also possible due to prevalent natural organic matters. Therefore, alginate, albumin (BSA), and humic acid (HA) have been chosen as model organic foulants to study the effect of combined fouling in water flux behavior during the long term operation of the FDFO desalination process. 60 mg/l alginate has been found to aggravate inorganic scaling leading to a decrease in water flux of more than 30%.

Physical cleaning with cross-flow rates similar to normal FDFO process has been adopted to evaluate the effectiveness of restoring the membrane flux after inorganic scaling. The flux recovery is about 80-97% depending on the type of

the DS. However, when the cross-flow rate is increased, the water flux is restored almost in full, irrespective of the type of DS and DS concentration used.